The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
MAY
20
1917
PERIODICAL DIVISION

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 11
No. 1

MAY
1917

GOVERNMENT A MAN'S JOB

FOR THE SAFETY OF DEMOCRACY

WOMAN SUFFRAGE OR WOMAN'S SERVICE

AN ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM

SUFFRAGIST CAUGHT AGAIN "TAKING CHANCES" WITH TRUTH

FEDERAL AMENDMENT HEARINGS

QUESTIONS OF CONSCIENCE

A RIGHT RESERVED TO THE PEOPLE

CHANGING THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS

A SUFFRAGE BANNER ON CONSTANT PARADE

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Greenville, Del.; Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo, N. Dak.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Harry P. Virgin, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. Stephen S. Fitz Gerald, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Plainfield, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.
Miss N. V. Baker, Selma, Ala.
Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas, S. Dak.
Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville, Texas.
Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston, W. Va.
Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington, Iowa.
Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Milwaukee, Wis.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles H. Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Ayla Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Cornelius Morse.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.
Chairman, Executive Committee, Mrs. Arthur Wallace Dunn.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 1032 North Fourth Street, Burlington.
President, Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French, Davenport.
Secretary, Miss Mary Chittenden, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. F. I. Herriott, Des Moines.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. Harry P. Virgin, Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Wm. H. Bradford.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse, Pikesville.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 103 Read Street, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitz Gerald.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, Detroit.
First Vice-President, Mrs. L. E. Clark.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Recording Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 280 Madison Ave., New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. Eleanor G. Hewitt.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. G. Gunderson, Mrs. H. R. Hopkins, Mrs. E. B. Goss.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Ralph Beard.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Chaffee.

OHIO

Office: 1744 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield, Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B. Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Vice-President, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Post-office Box 368, Richmond.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1102 Kanawha Street, Charleston.
Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

GOVERNMENT A MAN'S JOB

THE WAR TEACHES A BELIEVER IN WOMAN SUFFRAGE TO OPPOSE THE EXTENSION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

An Address Delivered at Cooper Union, April 30th, by HENRY A. WISE WOOD.

I APPROACH the subject of woman suffrage to-night with the utmost diffidence and reverence. When a man undertakes to deal with the subject of woman, her privileges, her rights, and her functions, he must approach the subject as if he were approaching a shrine.

He must acknowledge that all that he is came from woman and that all of his happiness, aside from that of his work, comes from woman. Thoughts of his mother, his wife, his daughters, of all of the women who enter into his affections, must make him pause lest he work them an injury.

Thoughtful men know that of all of the elements that make up life none is so worthy of cultivation, even of glorification, as woman. In America this is so to an extent elsewhere unknown. Here, if anywhere in the world, woman approaches to the state of divinity.

All that she asks of man, that he gives her, whether it works her happiness or sorrow. She has asked for equal rights. To that I say she is entitled not alone to equal, but to superior rights. But there are rights and there are functions. There is her right to be safe. Let us define a right. It is the right of a man to arm himself to go into battle, and with his own hand to slay the enemies of his country. It is not the right of a woman to do this thing. It is the right of the man to defend a woman; and it is the right of the woman that he should defend her. It is not the right of the woman to enter battle, and it is not the right of the man to permit the woman to defend him.

It is plain, then, that their rights cannot be equal, nor their functions identical, because the woman's rights are superior to the man's and her functions are different. It is his right to defend her and himself, and it is her right to demand that he shall do both, and it is her function to render him the assistance for which he asks.

Woman put gentleness, love and mercy into life; man put into it resolution and force. Without resolution and force, gentleness, love and mercy cannot survive. Woman, in her distress, ever has and ever shall cry out for help, and man, in her danger, ever has and ever shall go to her assistance.

Here, my friends, is no equality of right, but the superiority of right—the woman first—and here a difference of function.

There are functions that men only can perform, and these are the functions of defense.

Woman has asked for the vote, in order that she may perform the functions of man in government. I already have said that whatever woman in America asks of a man that he gives her, whether it works her happiness or sorrow. Three years ago I said, in answer to her cry for the ballot: "Yes, let the woman participate in all of the functions of government; let her, too, take the wheel of the Ship of State, and let us teach her to steer."

But then the seas of the world were calm, with no danger in sight. The wars of the world had been fought, we thought, with nothing ahead to solve but social problems. Let the woman mount the bridge; let her help to run the ship.

My friends, we were living in a fool's paradise; upon the brink of civilization's greatest cataclysm. After centuries of the development of chivalrous warfare we were suddenly to be plunged into the abyss of what our enemies call absolute war; the war of the brute, which is to discard all of the codes of chivalry and to kill, to burn, to enslave, to rape, to mutilate, for the sake of their terrifying spectacle. And into this war we have gone.

Where, three years ago, I said to the woman who wished to take hold of the wheel of the Ship of State, "Yes!" now I say to her "No!" This, from now on, is a man's job. Gentleness, love and mercy are needed, but they are no longer in place on the bridge; there there is room only for resolution and force.

To-day the world's every Ship of State is in distress; on the bridge, and at every important station there must be men in control. Women have their part, but it is with the immensely important work below decks. Theirs, indubitably, is not the function of government, or direction, in the hour of danger.

This has suddenly become a masculine age. It calls for the uttermost assertion of the martial instincts of mankind. To be strong is to prevail; to be weak is to invite defeat, to suffer national disaster, the woman with the man.

The nation that in this emergency permits women to usurp the governmental functions of men will rue the day that it exchanged masculine strength for feminine weakness.

The determined stand that the suffrage leaders, one and all, have taken to defeat our preparations for defense and to compel us to accept, in the guise of peace, degradation at the hands of Germany is an augury of where we as a nation will end if the political power which these leaders are trying to grasp is finally put into their hands.

Never was there a more eloquent confession of woman's inability to support the strains of a war council than that so pathetically made by Miss Rankin in the moment of national crisis, when, in her agony, she cried out, "I want to stand by my country, but I cannot vote for war!"

And again, when on April 25th, in reply to a demand from her constituents that she support the President's selective conscription measure, passed but three days later by an enormous majority, she wired: "I have heard of no one in the House who is supporting the President's conscription bill. Do you wish me to stand alone for this?"

For these weighty and fundamental reasons I am unalterably opposed to woman's suffrage, although, as I have said, but three years ago I was its hearty advocate. These three years have taught me that a nation's freedom is to be safeguarded not by the display of gentleness, or love, or mercy, but solely by a nation's ability to crush with brute force whoever unjustly assails it. To create, direct and deliver brute force is a man's, not a woman's, job.

Men, I am convinced that our first duty is to remasculinize America; and that to this end we in this State must stand as a wall against the wave of effeminacy which now threatens the semi-emasculation of our electorate.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. XI May, 1917 No. 1

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

FOR THE SAFETY OF DEMOCRACY

WE are in this war "to make the world safe for democracy." To safeguard our democracy we require every man who becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States to swear to defend its *Constitution* against all foreign and *domestic* enemies.

Every anti-suffragist would rather be devoting herself exclusively to the non-partisan service of her country and her family than to the opposition to woman suffrage. This has always been our position. But we must not forget that as American men who did not start or will this war must fight a foreign foe if the United States is to continue, so we women must opopse a *domestic* enemy of our United States Constitution.

As the men must fight the submarine menace, we must fight the suffrage menace in the defense of democracy. There is no doubt whatever that the success of self-government is at stake in both campaigns. Both make use of glib, euphemistic slogans which mean the opposite of what they say. The Kaiser is sinking ships to get what *he* calls "freedom of the seas." The suffragists are trying to destroy democracy under the pretense of "freedom for women."

They are working for the overthrow of representative government in four different ways:

1. They are trying to make men officially known as "representatives" *misrepresent* the known will of the people.

2. They are trying to make the ballot *misrepresent* the *man* power of the country—the purpose for which the ballot was born, and the only reason why the millionaire and the street sweeper each has one vote.

3. They are seeking to rob the States of the right to settle this question for themselves, as provided in State and Federal Constitutions, by referenda to the voters.

4. They are grossly misrepresenting the majority of the women of this country in nearly every phase of their agitation.

They are trying to overthrow majority rule, representative government and the real freedom of women, while *disfranchising* the men on this great issue.

Every reader of the PROTEST knows in detail how the suffragists are trying to do these things, but a brief review of recent events will fully demonstrate that they have not only tried to destroy representative government in these four ways, but that they have lately offered American women the greatest possible insult. They have placed a price on woman's patriotism. They have tried to sell woman's service for woman suffrage. They have demanded that the political woman be paid in advance for whatever the patriotic woman may do for our Government.

A full month after patriotic women organized the non-partisan National League for Woman's Service a hundred members of the National American Woman Suffrage Association met in Washington and decided to try to "corner" a sort of copyright or patent on women's service in war.

Every effort was made to exploit the services that suffragists *expected* to give or had *offered*. No mention was made in any official *suffrage* publication of the National League for Woman's Service, which was *doing the work*.

Two months after the National League for Woman's Service was organized the suffragists insisted that any work that all women do for the country should be paid for in advance by giving the political women the vote!

They have actually threatened rebellion unless their price is met! Does the reader hesitate to believe these facts? Hear, then, the spokesman of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, speaking before the United States Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage, April 20th:

"Women are asked to mobilize their forces in aid of a Government which has wronged them. * * * The hearts of women would beat more happily could they feel that our own Government had been true to the standard it now proposes to unfurl upon an international field. * * * We have been patient, ineffably patient; but we grow rebellious because the wrong done to the women of the United States is rendered more conspicuous by contrast with other lands. In no other country thus far has a referendum to a general electorate been demanded. * * *"—Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, as quoted by the *Woman's Journal*, official suffrage organ.

What man would dare threaten "rebellion" at this time and intimate that men's services to their country were conditional upon a political reward? What man would reveal his contempt for his country in the very act of trying to sell it the services of its citizens?

Suffragists are "rebellious" because America is more *democratic* than other lands; because the people of forty-seven States in the Union have a right to vote on State constitutional amendments.

This is the right suffragists are trying to destroy by Federal amendment. *The democracy for which Washington fought and Lincoln died, the foremost democracy in the world, is held up to public scorn by the suffragists because it allows the people to defeat or adopt woman suffrage at the polls!*

SUFFRAGE OPINION VS. UNITED STATES LAW

ON February 11, 1916, the *Post Dispatch* of St. Louis, Mo., contained the following report:

"Mrs. Catt made an address upon 'Democracy' at the dinner (at the American Hotel Annex) last night.

"She opposed preparedness, saying: 'As a democracy this country should only strive to be prepared for the substitution of international courts for wars.' She said: 'This nation has no right to expect any of its large number of citizens of foreign birth to bear arms against the countries of their kin.'"

Suffrage ideas of "democracy" are not those of the United States Government, it seems, as many naturalized citizens *are doing*, and all are required by law to make oath to do, if necessary, exactly what the suffrage leader declares "this nation has no right to expect."

ANTI-SUFFRAGE—FOR POSITIVE PATRIOTISM

SOME persons depreciate the anti-suffrage movement because they say it is "negative." So is Government—and so are eight of the ten commandments. Every law on the statute books contains a "thou shalt not" with a penalty attached, and every soldier, sailor and policeman in a democracy is a defender, rather than an aggressor.

But that a "negative" movement may be based on the most positive principles of patriotism was strikingly demonstrated at the Patriotic Anti-Suffrage Mass Meeting at Cooper Union, April 30th.

The meeting was held under the auspices of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Mr. Ezra Prentice presided, and made a forceful introductory address, pointing out the possibilities of the present crisis, and its demands on patriotism. Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, president of the New York State Association, followed with an address printed below.

Then Dr. Joseph Silberman, of Temple Emanu-El, literally inspired the meeting with an eloquent appeal for patriotic action. "There are countries which we must teach civilization with a cannon," he declared. "Pacifism has become intolerable. Patriotism demands the self-consecration of every man and every woman to the needs of humanity." He called upon every citizen to fit himself or herself, physically, mentally and morally, to answer the question this world war will ask all Americans, "Are we a nation of heroes?" (Dr. Silberman's patriotic address, revised for use as an article, will appear in next month's PROTEST.)

Mr. Henry A. Wise Wood, who has taken a most prominent part in the movement for national preparedness, was the next speaker. He was formerly a suffragist. His reasons for changing his opinion are given on page 3.

Miss Marjorie Dorman spoke on anti-suffrage, and was vigorously applauded throughout her address.

Mr. George W. Wickersham, former Attorney-General of the United States, was the next speaker. Mr. Wickersham's address is printed on page 6.

WOMAN'S SERVICE OR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

An Address by MISS ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN

President, New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

I AM sure there are no men or women in this audience to-night who have not within recent weeks rededicated themselves both in spirit and in action to the service of our beloved country. James Russell Lowell said:

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide
In the strife of Truth and Falsehood for the good or evil side."

Within the past few weeks this nation has made a tremendous decision on the side of truth and righteousness, and I am sure we are all agreed that we are proud at last to stand just where we belong, by the side of those great nations fighting to uphold the principles for which we fought 140 years ago.

Our Anti-Suffrage Association feels it is especially justified in holding a patriotic meeting at this time, for over a year ago we passed a resolution endorsing the adoption of adequate measures for national defense, and declaring that women everywhere should strive to further the cause of preparedness by the study of the conservation of food supply and by thrift and economy in household management. Within recent months our association took an unqualified stand in favor of universal military service, believing that such service furthers the ideals of democracy and affirms individual responsibility to the State.

It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the war service which the women of this country are prepared to give in this crisis; you have but to read the daily papers to understand the variety of their activities. In all wars true women have always stood back of their men on the firing line and the American woman will not be found wanting in the coming months of stress and strife.

The women are, however, entering upon this service with two different attitudes. The president of the National Woman Suffrage Association announced at a public meeting in New York in March:

"We ask the vote as a war measure just as the emancipation of the slaves was a war measure. We ask it that women may have the feeling that they have been recognized as assets of the nation before that nation falls back upon them for war services," and some male advocates of woman suffrage have likewise expressed this sentiment.

This point of view is not only foreign, but abhorrent to anti-suffragists.

We stand ready to give the best there is in us in the service of our country at this time, without the least desire or expectation of any reward whatever for services rendered.

A truly patriotic woman wants no reward for her work.

Woman's service to the state as to the family is unselfish, unconditional and unremitting.

The suggestion that (the State) shall offer women the political payment of a vote for war services is a direct slur on woman's patriotism.

What the vast majority of women need and desire at this period of national crisis with the extra duties imposed by the war is exemption from political competition with men or with women. To force women into partisan politics is to divert women from non-partisan services.

It has been said the ballot is a symbol of liberty. We claim that its absence is a symbol of something more valuable to the State—the symbol of disinterested service. Think what it means to the State and to the nation, whether in time of peace or in time of war, to have a band of disinterested non-partisan citizens willing to do their "bit" without any thought of political reward or preferment.

We therefore protest most earnestly against the placing of a political price on woman's patriotism and ask the men of New York to vote "No" on the woman suffrage amendment next November.

AN ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM

Former Attorney-General of the United States

THE American man in time of peace is an easy-going, trouble-avoiding creature. Especially in his dealings with women, he seems to have laid to heart Shakespeare's admonition:

"In peace there's nothing so becomes a man,
As meekness and humility."

The common answer given by the average man who declares himself in favor of woman suffrage is, "Oh, well, the women want it and we might as well let them have it." Whether or not it is good for them; or still more important, whether or not it is to the interest of the commonwealth that our already complex electorate should be further complicated by female suffrage, is brushed aside as a matter of small moment. Yet I seriously question whether anything like a majority of the men of any American community are in favor of giving women the vote. There are many reasons against it. Some are obvious. It is difficult to discuss the question frankly. Most men feel a hesitancy in discussing in a mixed assemblage the fundamental questions of sex that radically differentiate women from men. The divine privilege of motherhood would seem to me to be of far higher import than the vote, and I am one of those who still think of women as the objects of love, of adoration, of reverence, whether as sweethearts, wives or mothers, and therefore, the thought of them engaged in electioneering, haranguing crowds from wagons or soap boxes, as one sees many women nowadays, is repugnant to all my ideas of womanhood.

Despite the clamorous claims of the advocates of votes for women, there is no preponderance of evidence that the communities in which they have secured that privilege are any better for it. No wise laws for the protection of women and children have been enacted in the suffrage States that are not to be found on the statute books of New York. It may be seriously questioned whether in States where they have no vote women do not possess more real influence for good than in States where they have the suffrage. Certainly no woman in this State can with justice complain that its laws or their administration discriminate against her or the interests of her sex.

At this point Mr. Wickersham read a clipping from the New York *Tribune* of April 16th:

WASHINGTON, April 15th.—The National Woman Suffrage headquarters gave out to-night a statement by and for Helen Ring Robinson, a State Senator in Colorado, as follows:

"I have come to Washington on private matters, but now that I am here I want to make my protest against this conscription proposal before it is too late.

"We voting women in the West have been greatly disturbed over the War Department's suggestion that our boys shall be drafted forthwith for this war. We are willing to give them, yes, but we are not yet willing to see them reduced to the level of European conscripts.

"Before we yield to the conscription of life we demand the conscription of property for this war. The superfluous millions of Mr. Rockefeller, for instance, should be conscripted for the country's use ahead of the life of the young lad whose life is all he has. The West will certainly oppose the conscription of men unless accompanied by the conscription of money."

Mr. Wickersham resumed his address as follows:

Two years ago New York defeated the suffrage amendment by nearly two hundred thousand majority. Is it likely that the men of this State will reverse that decision at the outbreak of war with one of the greatest military nations of history? Do Miss Rankin and Helen Robinson suggest added strength and wisdom at a time when both are needed in the councils of State and nation? Doubtless the ladies who have been so stridently advocating female suffrage and who have poured out their money and their voices so lavishly in its support will now find a better avenue for their talents in the various activities furnished by war conditions. But does this fact justify them in assuming that they must be rewarded, and rewarded in advance of service, by receiving the suffrage? The wives and mothers of France have furnished to the world a model of high-hearted, courageous devotion to their country and a capacity for organization and service not excelled even by the women of New York. But we have yet to hear that any considerable number of them are seeking the vote. In France a woman never seems to forget that she is first of all a woman, and her mission in these later years seems to have been to make France and the world realize that next to being a fighting man, there is nothing more glorious than womanhood, and that the supreme glory consists in being the mother of a son who gives his life for his country. Cannot the women of America emulate their sisters beyond the sea and learn that not by intruding upon man's estate is their sex to be glorified, but rather by making of their womanhood that holy thing that for centuries has held mankind in thraldom to them.

"ENOUGH TO DOOM HER"

(Reprinted from the Summit, N. J., *Herald*)

HOW SUFFRAGE LOOKS TO ME

I SCAN the daily papers o'er, and learn of many things;
I study war developments and timely happenings.
I love to read the household hints or fashion page peruse,
But I feel no interest in each morning's suffrage news.

I understand, as well as most, a screed of wise portent;
A lucid proposition or a line of argument.
But never have I heard or read a suffrage speech—have you?
That showed a sense of values or ratiocination true.

I'm open to conviction, but, so far, it seems to me
The suffragists have simply failed to prove their right to be.
They babble hackneyed phrases of amendments and of laws,
Of Progress and of Issues and of what they call "The Cause."

But I have never seen one yet who clearly could explain
Just what she is and what she wants and what she hopes to gain;
And, quite aside from all such things, this is enough to doom her,
I've NEVER seen a suffragist who had a sense of humor!

CAROLYN WELLS.

SUFFRAGIST CAUGHT AGAIN "TAKING CHANCES WITH THE TRUTH"

By Miss Minnie Bronson, General Secretary, National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

THE National American Woman Suffrage Association has issued a book entitled, "Woman Suffrage by Federal Constitutional Amendment," compiled by Mrs. C. C. Catt, and said to have been placed in the hands of every member of Congress.

Four of its six chapters are written by Mrs. Catt herself and present many excellent examples of the principle known in logic as *reductio ad absurdum*. If this were the chief fault, the book would be absolutely useless as an argument and unworthy of reply. But when the author, who is the leading representative of woman suffrage in America, attempts to influence the Congress of the United States by spiteful attacks and flagrant misstatements not only about anti-suffrage workers, but whole conventions and the electorates of every State that has defeated her "cause," exposure of her methods and refutation of her false charges becomes a duty, much as we regret the necessity.

Perhaps the worst attack in the book is that made on Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, a leading anti-suffrage speaker, who debated against Mrs. Catt at the Democratic State Convention at Parkersburg, W. Va. According to every newspaper in Parkersburg, Mrs. Oliphant defeated Mrs. Catt in this debate.

Smarting under the lash of defeat, Mrs. Catt attempts to "get even" with the anti-suffrage speaker by discrediting her.

On page 46 of her book Mrs. Catt says:

"At the Democratic convention an anti woman suffragist spoke. The applause in the gallery and in the standing groups filling the outside aisles was uproarious and clearly represented an organized and carefully planted claque. The leaders were an ex-brewer, an ex-saloon keeper and the chief liquor lobbyist of the State. It was evident that they were there to intimidate the party, and they did. * * * The wets apparently had the State literally by the throat."

These quotations were called to the attention of Mr. A. S. Johnston, editor and publisher of the *Monroe Watchman* and a delegate who was present at the convention and heard the debate. His reply follows:

Union, W. Va., April 28, 1917.

Miss Minnie Bronson,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Miss Bronson:

I note with surprise the statements you quote from pages 46 and 47 of Mrs. Catt's book, "Woman Suffrage by Federal Constitutional Amendment," because they are so completely out of harmony with the truth.

I was a member of the Democratic State Convention of West Virginia at Parkersburg last year and have some knowledge of what occurred there. I never before heard the charge made that there was an anti-suffrage claque organized to applaud Mrs. Oliphant in her joint debate with Mrs. Catt on that occasion, and "to intimidate the party." No such thing was done.

It was not known until very late that the anti-suffragists would have a representative present. Mrs. Catt had been well advertised; but Mrs. Oliphant's presence on the platform was unexpected to the most of us. It was almost an impromptu debate with practically no opportunity given for the organization of a claque in favor of the antis, even had there been any disposition to do so. The outcome of the joint debate was, in all fairness, the routing of Mrs. Catt by her adversary.

The applause of Mrs. Oliphant came from the delegates and was spontaneous and overwhelming. Mrs. Catt was treated quite respectfully; and it is the unlovely spectacle of a narrow and malignant spirit that she exhibits now in traducing the convention whose guest she was because its members showed they recognized she was overthrown in her joint debate with Mrs. Oliphant.

As for the liquor interests which Mrs. Catt intimates cut a big figure in the convention, they are the creatures of her own perfervid imagination. The liquor question was not an issue in last year's campaign in West Virginia, in reality, though certain over-zealous woman suffragists pretended that the mysterious "liquor interests" (so-called) were backing the anti-suffragists—a charge which never had the least foundation in fact. The Prohibition amendment was adopted in 1912 by the largest majority ever given by West Virginia to any measure or candidate—a majority only surpassed by that cast for the rejection of the woman suffrage amendment in 1916. Neither party would dare to oppose prohibition in West Virginia, and Mrs. Catt's charge that the "liquor interests" intimidated the Democratic State Convention of 1916, or had aught to do with the defeat of the woman suffrage amendment, is preposterous nonsense.

Mrs. Catt shows that she is a loser so bad and spiteful that she disqualifies herself for public confidence and leadership.

Very sincerely,
(Signed) A. S. Johnston.

"IF NOT, WHY NOT?"

ON page 41 of her book Mrs. C. C. Catt says:

"On November 7, 1916, woman suffrage and prohibition amendments were voted upon in South Dakota. It was the first time these two questions have gone to referendum in the same election [This assertion is inaccurate—M. B.] and *the results furnish interesting data for comparison.* * * *

"Hutchinson County, for example, carried prohibition and lost woman suffrage. It gave 584 dry votes; 510 wet votes. It gave 432 'yes' votes and 1,583 'no' votes. Thus 921 more votes were cast on suffrage than on the prohibition question. The people of this country are German Russians and *exceedingly ignorant.* Apparently they were not intelligent enough to be *lined up* to vote 'no' on both questions. Is it not likely that these votes were intended to be 'wet' and that they made a mistake and picked No. 6 instead of No. 7? *If not, why not?*" [Italics ours.]

Well, first because the figures given for Hutchinson County are as far-fetched as the elaborate theory in explanation. Hutchinson County did not cast 584 dry votes and 510 wet votes, as Mrs. Catt says, but 837 dry votes and 1,326 wet votes, as shown in the official returns! Instead of 921 more votes being cast on suffrage than on prohibition, there were 148 more votes cast on prohibition than on suffrage. There were 404 more dry votes than suffrage votes, 257 more anti votes than wet votes. Yet to uphold a theory and to cast a slur upon the intelligence of the voters of Hutchinson County, Mrs. Catt used the *suffrage* figures for that county and the *prohibition* figures for Hughes County! (See page 28, Official Returns for South Dakota, Nov. 7, 1916.)

But let us see how "if not, why not" logic works when applied to the correct figures for the South Dakota election.

Hutchinson County, singled out by Mrs. Catt, has, according to the same authority, 9,648 foreign-born population. Turner County has 9,634 foreign-born population, a difference of 14 persons.

The number of "exceedingly ignorant" persons is about the same in both counties. But in Turner County they were "intelligent enough to be lined up" to give the wets and the suffragists the same number of votes, although prohibition and anti-suffrage both won out in Turner County as well as the State!

Exactly 1,028 suffrage votes were cast, and exactly 1,028 wet votes were cast in Turner County!

Does it not appear likely that *every suffragist in Turner County was told to vote wet,* and that every one did vote wet? *If not, why not?*

In Hughes County there were 515 suffrage votes and 510 wet votes. Is it not likely that *every suffragist in Hughes County was told to vote "wet"* and that all but *five* obeyed? *If not, why not?*

In the whole State of South Dakota there were 53,432 suffrage votes and 53,380 wet votes. Does it not appear that *every suffragist in South Dakota* was told to vote "wet" and that all but *fifty-two* of them did vote wet? *If not, why not?*

Let us apply the system again. California gave the Republican Senator a majority of nearly 300,000. It gave the Democratic presidential electors a majority of only 3,000. Does it not appear that there must have been 3,000 women in California so "ignorant" that they could not be "lined up" to vote for a Republican President as well as a Republican Senator, and that they cast their votes for the Democratic candidate by mistake? *If not, why not?*

FEDERAL AMENDMENT HEARINGS

THE United States Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage granted the anti-suffragists a hearing at Washington at 10 A. M. on May 2d. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, briefly expressed regret that anti-suffragists were obliged to take up the time of the Committee when we are at one of the greatest crises which has confronted the country, and introduced Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., wife of the senior senator from New York. Mrs. Wadsworth took charge of the hearing, speaking in part as follows:

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee: We are here to-day in self-defense. It is entirely against our inclination that we are taking up your time and our own this morning, for the purpose of protecting ourselves against the stigma of having let this fight go by default. I have the authority to speak for our National Association, and the backing of my own District Association, in saying that we would be only too glad if the women on both sides of the question would agree to a cessation of hostilities, at least on the Federal amendment, until the war is over, so that the women of America could present an undivided loyalty to their country and thereby double the efficiency and power of its working force. I am afraid, however, that this is far too reasonable a suggestion to be acted upon by our friends the enemy, so as long as they continue to fight, we must continue to defend ourselves.

Mrs. Wadsworth then introduced Miss Minnie Bronson, who spoke at length in refutation of some of the remarkable campaign charges made by the president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association before the same committee a week previously, and in answer to many arguments presented by her in the form of a book which is said to have been sent to every member of Congress.

After Miss Bronson's speech—parts of which will appear in the PROTEST as separate articles—Miss Lucy Price addressed the Committee on Democracy, scoring some strong points.

"The president of the National Suffrage Association asked you to remember that nineteen States have voted on woman suffrage during the past five years, of which only six were won. We also ask you to remember it, gentlemen," Miss Price concluded.

Judge Oscar Leser of Baltimore presented a legal argument against the Federal amendment.

The hearing was closed with an address by Mrs. A. J. George of Massachusetts.

The complete report of the hearing will be available later as a Government document. The PROTEST will cover all the important points in future issues.

THE Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives held a hearing on May 15th, at which advocates for and against woman suffrage appeared. Next month's PROTEST will contain details.

BE sure to let your representative in Congress know that you understand representation to mean what it says; that you consider an oath to uphold the Constitution inconsistent with a vote to destroy the right of the States, recognized in the United States Constitution, and the platforms of both parties, to regulate woman suffrage in accordance with local conditions and the will of the people.

QUESTIONS OF CONSCIENCE AND DEMOCRACY

HOW can a man who has *sworn to uphold* the United States Constitution justify a vote in favor of woman suffrage by Federal amendment?

How can a man who has *sworn to uphold* his State Constitution justify a vote in favor of presidential woman suffrage *without* submitting a regular amendment *to the voters*, as his State Constitution provides?

The United States Constitution provides two ways for its amendment: 1. Congress, by a two-thirds vote, may submit the amendment to conventions of *delegates*, chosen by the *people* of the several States. 2. Congress, by a two-thirds vote, may submit the amendment to the State *Legislatures* for ratification.

The *first* method allows the people to choose delegates specifically to represent them *on this question*.

The second method can be employed to *disfranchise* the voters on this question, although the framers of the United States Constitution would have been the last men in the world to have so used it *against the people*. (See page 12.)

It is by *this* method, and for this purpose, that the suffragists are demanding a Federal amendment.

This method gives 51 per cent. of the members of the *Nevada Legislature* a chance to decide who shall vote for the Governor of *New York*—a power not even possessed by the *New York* Legislature under the New York State Constitution!

This method gives 51 per cent. of the members of the Legislature of Wyoming a chance to double the electorate and vastly increase the election expenses of the *City of New York*—after the *people* of New York city have overwhelmingly defeated woman suffrage at the polls!

No other amendment to the United States Constitution has *ever* been proposed *for the specific purpose* of disfranchising the voters of the several States on a public issue they have crushingly defeated by popular vote!

No other amendment to the United States Constitution has ever been proposed *for the specific purpose* of circumventing the will of the people!

Suffragists ask for a Federal amendment *precisely because* woman suffrage has recently been defeated *sixteen times* at the polls.

Presidential suffrage by Legislative action is asked *precisely because* State Constitutions provide that this question be *submitted to the people!*

Is an oath to uphold a State or Federal Constitution binding?

Can a man uphold a National Constitution while seeking to destroy its provisions by juggling its amending machinery?

Can a man uphold a State Constitution while seeking to evade and *nullify* its provisions by Legislative action not contemplated therein?

This is a question of conscience, in addition to the question of *representing the people.*

Woman suffrage has been defeated by some of the greatest proportionate majorities ever recorded in the United States!

Out of 6,112,509 votes cast on this question in thirteen States, a majority of 1,090,451 was given against woman suffrage!

This is nearly *double* the popular majority given President Wilson out of more than 18,000,000 votes cast in 1916.

It is a greater proportionate majority than was ever given to a President of the United States!

And not one of these 6,112,509 voters has ever been indicted for casting an illegal vote against woman suffrage. Not one man in more than six million has ever been accused *in court* of illegally influencing another to cast such a vote!

"Bribers and illiterates are the allies of the antis," repeatedly declares the leading woman suffragist of America, but not one scintilla of *evidence* has ever been produced to sustain this *epithet*.

If there *were* such evidence, suffragists would *produce* it. They do not, *because they cannot*.

Not one demand for a recount has ever shown that woman suffrage was defeated by fraud. Not one man or woman has testified in court that the laws have ever been violated in an election on woman suffrage, or accused *any individual by name* of such a crime.

Such a record is without a parallel in American politics!

There is no question that the people of the several States have ever determined by popular vote which has shown such a large, consistent, sincere and law-abiding majority as that given against woman suffrage in the last three years!

The suffrage demand that this great majority be disfranchised on this question, and that the will of the majority of the women be ignored, is a direct insult to democracy.

How can any man entitled to call himself a "representative" vote for woman suffrage by Federal amendment, or vote for presidential suffrage, when full suffrage is defeated at the polls?

CHANGING THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS

THE so-called conservative suffragists are now posing as altogether different from the sort who picket the White House, heckle the President, etc. The so-called conservatives boast of their "non-partisanship," of their "womanliness," of their detest for "militant methods." Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, suffrage historian, has announced that she is even opposed to the yellow banner, because the Congressional Union and the Woman's Party, the confessed "radicals," have used it so much in combination with the colors of Mrs. Pankhurst.

The leopard is trying to whitewash its spots. The public should not forget that the new pose of the so-called conservatives is dangerous.

As a matter of fact, they are posing as conservatives only because of anti-suffrage criticism! *We have their words for it.*

In 1913, Mrs. Catt, conservative leader, was ready to "tear the Constitution to shreds" to pass the Federal amendment. In the same year, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, conservative leader, derisively described the antis at a Congressional hearing as "that little band of professional anti-women going around the country advocating home, heaven and mother."

In those days, "Feminism" was in its glory.

The infamous "Bondwoman," declaring that "the freewoman should be in a position to bear children if she wants them without soliciting maintenance from any man, whoever he may be," was being circulated by the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Bright stars of praise were being showered on Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, who said "the home is no more holy than the post-office," and compared married women with women of the street. She said:

"The transient trade we think evil. The bargain for life we think good. But the biological effect is the same . . . When we confront this fact boldly and plainly in the open market of vice, we are sick with horror. When we see the same economic law made permanent, established by law, sanctioned and sanctified by religion, covered with flowers and incense . . . we think it innocent, lovely and right. ("Women and Economics.")

The book containing these radical feminist doctrines was given seven stars of praise—the highest award—in "The Case for Woman Suffrage," a bibliography published in 1913 by the National College Equal Suffrage League. The "Case," page 80, says of this book:

"This and Mill's *Subjection of Women* are the two epoch-making books on the woman question."

"The Case for Woman Suffrage,' page 64, also declared:

"Perhaps the chief thing to be said for the suffrage is precisely that it will make woman less womanly, in the commonly accepted sense of the term . . . One cannot argue logically on woman suffrage without facing this fact."

In 1914, the National American Woman Suffrage Association financially supported the infamous *Masses* by awarding it a long advertising contract, and Max Eastman, its editor, socialist and feminist, was given first place in the list of "What to Read on Woman Suffrage," for his pamphlet attacking the "home and mother sentiment." This also was given six stars of praise in "The Case for Woman Suffrage."

In 1915, the president of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party signed—with other suffragists—an appeal for money for *The Masses* in the name of modern woman, and as a grateful token of remembrance for its special suffrage edition, October and November, 1915. She is now sorry that she did it. She has not, however, repudiated her action, nor *The Masses*, although she condemns a certain offensive ballad *The Masses* printed a month before it printed her indorsement.

This is the record. No one can question it or protest against it.

But the conservative suffragists have ceased the open advocacy of such doctrines.

Why? Let them answer:

"In Europe the whole woman movement centers on social problems as they affect women: marriage, divorce, economic independence, the rights of women with regard to children—legitimate and illegitimate. All the subjects which American suffragists do not discuss constitute the major part of the European movement, with suffrage as a minor issue. Here, the political aspect of the movement is the only one which has an appeal sufficiently extensive to merit organization. American women classify themselves as suffragists and feminists, and curiously enough, the feminist is regarded as a liability to the suffrage movement.

"This separation of suffragism and feminism is due partly to the desire of suffragists to avoid alliance with other reforms, but chiefly to the type of campaign waged by the organized anti-suffragists since the beginning of the struggle."—*Woman Voter*, page 20, June, 1916.

In other words, suffragists consider feminism another "reform," but one which they do not now dare advocate openly, on account of anti-suffrage criticism.

Take another instance. On July 9, 1915, after Professor Thomas explained his radical feminist views at the National Suffrage Association dinner at the Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Dr. Shaw was quoted as saying, "Political emancipation is not the only emancipation. There is a greater freedom which women must gain, the freedom of social relations." But a New Jersey suffragist rose and protested against the professor's advocacy of woman's "right to motherhood," regardless of the formality of marriage. She said:

"It was uncalled for and out of place. In a short time the anti-suffragists will be making use of these statements, declaring that free love is the foundation of the ideals of suffragists. It will be used against us, will do untold harm, and blacken us even to those who are friendly to our cause."

As a matter of fact, the anti-suffragists have never quoted the Thomas address in any extended manner. What we have always pointed out is the fact that only two women present protested against it, and that they could not get their association to repudiate or condemn it, although they did pass a resolution of thanks to one newspaper for not printing it!

The so-called conservative suffrage movement has assumed a more virtuous pose right along. In the beginning, the chief opponents of the movement were the clergy, we are officially told in "The History of Woman Suffrage."

"Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women for the Overthrow of the Monopoly of the Pulpit. (Passed at first Woman's Rights Convention, 1848.)

"Resolved, That . . . we feel it a duty to declare in regard to the sacred cause which has brought us together, that the most Determined Opposition it encounters is from the Clergy, whose Teachings of the Bible are intensely inimical to the equality of woman with man." (Passed at Philadelphia Woman's Rights Convention, 1854.)

It was hard to get anywhere with the public through attacks on "man's monopoly of the pulpit," although several suffrage leaders became preachers with that intention, and several others compiled the famous *Woman's Bible*, edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, now suppressed.

It was finally found much more effective to ascribe all opposition to the "liquor and vice interests." This was done.

The "cause" was ashamed of the *Woman's Bible*, and called it in.

It is now ashamed of feminism, and would fain forget the remarks, several years ago, of its now apparently conservative leaders.

They derisively called the home "the isolated household" years ago, and its end was predicted.

"The advantages of the few whose fortunes enable them to make the isolated household a more successful experiment, cannot outweigh the difficulties of the many who are wholly sacrificed to its maintenance," the official History informs us.

In 1911, "The old home has crumbled to pieces. * * * The municipality, the State, the Nation have become over-parents," we were told in a pamphlet issued by the National Suffrage Association.

By 1915, however, the antis had changed all this. "Of course, woman's place is the home. We want the vote to help the home-makers," declared a big sign over a Pennsylvania suffrage headquarters.

The antis are actually reforming some of the suffragists, at least in their public utterances. Whether the reform is sincere or not, is another question. A movement does not become less dangerous when it becomes clever enough to be cautious.

The socialism of Mr. H. G. Wells is more insidious than that of Karl Marx, because it is less crude. The average socialist nowadays protests against the radical attacks upon the family made by the founders of the movement—but informed persons know that the initiated, the leaders, the recognized students of socialism admit its fundamental conflict with Christianity and the family as the unit of society. Socialism pleads—in the open—only for an economic adjustment. Suffrage now pleads—in the open—only for a political adjustment.

Opponents of suffrage would be neglecting a duty, failing in elemental astuteness, if they allowed themselves to be lulled into fancied security because the wolf now comes "in sheep's clothing."

A whitewashed leopard can bite as hard and fight as furiously as when his spots were visible. The worst claws are on animals with soft-padded feet.

MRS. CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN in an address in the rooms of the Chicago College Club yesterday declared herself "dead against mothers' pensions" and condemned alimony in no mild terms.

"It is bad enough to sell one's self for money when one delivers the goods," said Mrs. Gilman, "but there is no excuse for a woman to accept money from a man because he was once her husband, unless through her marriage with him she became invalided and incapacitated for taking her place in the business world.

"Mothers' pensions are all wrong, too; a pension puts motherhood on a commercial basis, and motherhood is not an economic function. The wedding ring is a relic of the old-time custom of placing a ring or band around the neck of a slave. Woman, however, has never belonged to herself. Even in marriage she has had to be 'given away.' Women ought to make laws governing motherhood. People say we do not respect the law. Why should we? They are man-made laws. We respect natural laws."
—Chicago *Herald*, March 8, 1917.

SUFFRAGE IN RELATION TO PATRIOTIC SERVICE

By MRS. MARGARET C. ROBINSON
President, Public Interests League of Massachusetts

THE suffragists are getting fine publicity through their offers to assist the President in the present crisis. They say they will "continue their co-operation with the Red Cross." In Massachusetts at the beginning of the war, when President Wilson issued a call for help for the Red Cross, and when both the suffragists and antis were asked to co-operate with the Red Cross, the suffragists replied that it was "not practical" (by which they probably meant not practicable) for them to do so as an organization. It was the antis who gave their large new headquarters as workrooms for the Red Cross for nearly two years; who organized Red Cross work in scores of places; raised money for all the materials used for many months, etc., etc., etc. In many other States the antis did similar service. Likewise, in June, 1916, when the Massachusetts militia was ordered suddenly to the Mexican border and there was great need of immediate help to many soldiers' families suddenly left without a breadwinner, it was the antis who were at hand in this emergency. The State was entirely without machinery to care for these families thus suddenly left dependent, so the Public Interests' League of Anti-Suffragists offered its services as an emergency committee to Adjutant-General Cole who gratefully accepted the offer, and installed their workers in headquarters, first at the Commonwealth Armory, later at the State House, where they were on duty every day and all day, advising and comforting the anxious women who came for counsel, and investigating and relieving cases of need. Until the committee appointed by the governor could get into working order the Public Interests League took entire charge of this work, and received from many quarters the highest praise for its efficiency in dealing with this side of the question of our country's defense.

Two weeks after this work had been undertaken, the Boston *Herald* published a letter by Miss Louie Stanwood, a prominent Boston suffragist, in which she said: "There are immediate and serious duties for the women to attend to here in Massachusetts in case of war. And in the preparation for that tragic contingency I am helping to gather independent suffragists into a committee for special patriotic service. I have already reported to His Excellency the Governor, and have learned at the State House that assistance in the matter of proper distribution of relief to the families of militiamen will be one of pressing need. We are already beginning to look into this." She also says: "Much of the constructive relief work must needs fall on suffragists because they have constructive minds (as in the case of the famous Women's Emergency Corps of England)."

This is an exhibition of typical suffrage psychology. Miss Stanwood is convinced that it is the suffragists who have "constructive minds," so she announces in the press that she is "looking into" the question of relief for the needy families of soldiers and gathering suffragists into a committee. The anti-suffragists, who, of course, could not possibly have "constructive minds," had merely been quietly engaged in this work of relief for these needy families since the day the need was realized, without taking time to write letters to the newspapers about it!

Similarly now while the suffragists are telling of the great things they are "going to do" for preparedness, it is the anti-suffragists who are actually at work, and have been for months.

It is enlightening to look over the annual report of the Massachusetts Branch of the Special Aid Association for American Preparedness. This Massachusetts Association was started in November, 1915, and has done extraordinarily fine work in educating the public as to the need of preparedness, and in preparedness work itself. Its president and treasurer are officers of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association. Of the ten members of its executive committee, eight are anti-suffragists. From January to November of 1916, 114 addresses were given in ninety-three cities and towns on preparedness; two-thirds of these were given by anti-suffragists. The chairman of the committee which had charge of educational exhibits of army and navy equipment with free lectures concerning them, is a prominent anti-suffragist. The chairman of the Home Relief Department, organized to care for the victims of disaster, whether of war or peace, is an officer of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association. The chairman of the committee on wireless telegraphy of the Active Corps of the Preparedness Society, herself an expert operator, is an anti-suffragist. The chairman of the Canteen Department of the Active Corps is a leading anti-suffragist. The chairman of the Woman's Volunteer Clerical Corps of the Emergency Committee of the National Civic Federation is a well-known speaker and writer on anti-suffrage. The chairman of the Women's Auxiliary to the Navy League is an anti-suffragist, as are several of the women on her committee. The membership director of the Boston Metropolitan Chapter of the Red Cross is a prominent anti-suffragist. One of the best-known anti-suffrage speakers in Massachusetts is speaking and organizing for the Red Cross. The head of the Sewing Department of the Massachusetts Red Cross is a member of the Executive Committee of the Public Interests League of Anti-Suffragists. The list could be extended indefinitely.

The branches of this Special Preparedness Society in many cities and towns of Massachusetts are directed by prominent anti-suffragists, and in other States the anti-suffragists could make a similar showing.

Besides "continuing their assistance to the Red Cross" what other services do the suffragists offer to the country in this crisis? They offer to take charge of the school centers and teach "international tolerance!" This, being interpreted, undoubtedly means that they would use the school centers to teach pacifism and woman suffrage. This they are already doing, however, to the great *injury* of the country rather than to its *help*. In one school in New York a very large per cent. of the boys refused to take the military training, which is the law of the State, because of the teachers' pacifist training. The Colorado press has expressed genuine anxiety over the fact that the education of the youth of that State is in the hands of woman teachers, many of whom are firmly opposed even to effective defense of our country.

Certain school centers are already being used by suffragists for their own propaganda. In Cambridge, the woman member of the school board recently had a suffrage play which she has written, called "Jonathan's Nightshirt," produced at one school center meeting, and followed the play with a suffrage speech. As the effect of woman suffrage in both Colorado and Chicago has been to place the public schools under most harmful political influence, it seems a great pity that the schools themselves should be used for propaganda which will result seriously to their hurt.

Thus, while the suffragists are securing countless columns in the press regarding the wonderful patriotic service they are "going to do" (although the mere offer caused a split in their ranks!) the anti-suffragists have been doing such work quietly and efficiently for a year and a half. The suffragists now clamor to be rewarded for the work which they have not done by having the vote given them! Incidentally, this would be to penalize the anti-suffragists who have given such patriotic service, by forcing them into politics against their will.

The situation in Canada is similar. Since the outbreak of the war the leading anti-suffragists have been giving unstintedly of their time, strength and money for their country's service, while the suffragists have been stump speaking throughout the country for woman suffrage. The Canadian anti-suffragists turned their whole organization into a huge Red Cross Society. The suffragists carried on their propaganda as usual, and by their threats managed to influence the government with the belief that they could help to turn some men out. The Canadian Government rewarded the suffragists for not doing patriotic work; they have punished the anti-suffragists for doing it.

The situation in England is the same. Anti-suffragists have been doing magnificent work for England and her allies from patriotic motives. To mention only one, Miss Dormer Maunder, a well-known English anti-suffragist, has established hospitals at Ostend, Rouen and at Bourbourg, and has been earnestly requested by the Belgian authorities to establish a fourth. So admirable has been her work that the Belgian King has conferred an order upon her. She has had one object in this—to help the helpless—and she has wasted no time in self-advertisement. The Women's Emergency Corps, on the other hand, which is made up of suffragists, has seemed to have for its object the advertisement and advancement of the suffrage cause quite as much as relief work.

A few weeks ago a ladies committee was called together in London for certain emergency war work; both suffragists and anti-suffragists were present and entered heartily into the scheme. When a day or two later, the practical work had to be carried out, it was found that only the anti-suffragists had offered their services. When her attention was called to the coincidences, the suffragist chairman excused the absence of the others on the ground that they were busy with propaganda work these days, as it was a case of now or never with woman suffrage—this, in spite of the fact that the suffragists had entered into an agreement with the anti-suffragists early in the war, not to carry on propaganda work during the war. Their agreement was merely "a scrap of paper." They were putting suffrage first, as Mrs. Catt and other suffrage leaders have repeatedly, since the war began, urged their followers in this country to do.

The English Government is making the tremendous mistake of promising women the vote as a supposed "reward" for their patriotic services. It has never been claimed that anything like a majority of English women wished the vote, and there is no room for doubt that the great majority of English women who have served their country so well in its great crisis (and who knows at what future cost to the race?) have no wish to assume political burdens for the rest of their lives. They have "done their bit" nobly—why not let them go back to their woman's job? In six months after women in large numbers had undertaken war work, infant mortality jumped to the highest rate in years. Commenting upon this alarming condition, an English writer says: "The first call on women ought to be for women's work. Just as maximum efficiency is not secured by sending skilled munition workers into the firing line, so it will not be secured by taking women from indispensable service which they alone can perform." If England accepts the suffrage doctrine that only men's work has worth and dignity—if she encourages women to devote their interest and energy to men's work while woman's work is left undone or badly done, she will reap the penalty in the downfall of her civilization, and may perceive her error only when it is too late.

A RIGHT RESERVED TO THE PEOPLE

SUFFRAGISTS who are trying to take advantage of the amendment provisions of the United States Constitution to throttle democracy and destroy local self-government are not usually moved by appeals to logic or the history of American institutions. But persons who sincerely believe that the woman suffrage amendment is similar to other proposed amendments should consider this emphatic difference: woman suffrage is a fundamental change in our form of government, and the only power in the United States justly entitled to change the form of government is reserved to the people themselves. *This was the first universally recognized principle of this Republic.* With one or two exceptions, it has been recognized in every State Constitution. It was vigorously asserted in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It was upheld by every State convention of the original thirteen States.

If we note the language of these documents, there can be no doubt on this subject. Could anything be clearer than this explanation of the Declaration of Independence, by Thomas Jefferson, its author:

"It was a declaration by the *representatives* of the United States of America in Congress assembled by the delegates appointed by the good *people* of the country as in a prior declaration of rights they were called. *It was not an act done by the State governments* then organized nor by persons *chosen by them.* It was emphatically the act of the whole *people* of the United Colonies through the instrumentality of their *representatives.* It was an act *not competent* to the State governments as organized under their charters. *Those charters neither contemplated the case nor provided for it.* It was an act of *original, inherent sovereignty* by the *people themselves,* resulting from *their* right to change the form of government and to institute a new government whenever necessary for their safety and happiness." [Italics ours.]—U. S. Senate Document, "Debates on the U. S. Constitution."

Our forefathers recognized that any change in the form of government was an act of "original, inherent sovereignty by the people themselves."

George Washington presided at our first Constitutional Convention in 1787. There can be no doubt that the framers of that document recognized this right of the people. In the letter of transmissal to the States, signed by George Washington, September 17, 1787, we find the following resolution:

"That the preceding Constitution be laid before the United States in Congress assembled and that it is the opinion of this convention that it should afterwards be submitted to a *convention of delegates* chosen in each State *by the people* thereof."—*Ibid.*

This was done. And we find this principle of representing the people so unanimously recognized by the conventions elected to ratify the original Constitution, that many of them began with these words:

"We, the delegates of the *people* of New York." "We, the delegates of the *people* of New Jersey," etc.

Our forefathers believed in representative government. They never would have consented to a proposal that the Constitution be juggled to destroy "the rights reserved to the States or to the people."

It is of no little significance that George Washington, "Father of His Country," suggested that the original Constitution be submitted to *"conventions of delegates chosen by the people."*

And the fact that Thomas Jefferson, "Father of American Democracy," was an *anti-suffragist,* while possessing "the clearest conception of democracy ever framed into language," in the words of Gilbert Chesterton, is no less noteworthy.

THE PROOF THAT THE MAJORITY OF WOMEN DO NOT DESIRE TO VOTE

IN 1916, there were 25,188,304 men qualified to vote in the United States, as nearly as the figure can be estimated from the United States Census. (This number is obtained by adding 65 per cent. of the *amount* of increase for ten years to the 1910 figures after subtracting the number of men reported as aliens. Thus we get 25,188,304 men qualified to register on October 15, 1916, exactly six years and a half after the Census was taken.)

These men cast at least 16,563,247 votes, or all except the less than 2,000,000 that were cast by *women.*

That women did cast less than 2,000,000 votes has been demonstrated mathematically. (See WOMAN'S PROTEST for January.)

Women were allowed to vote for Presidential electors in twelve States in 1916. There were about 4,160,315 women qualified to register. Of these, less than 47 per cent. voted. The exact number—estimated—was first given by an anti-suffrage statistician in the New York *Times.* The number was 1,950,463. That this was a *generous* estimate is proved by the fact that the same number was given as "official" by the publicity chairman of the National American Woman Suffrage Association in a recent letter by her to a Washington, D. C., newspaper.

It is also proved by the fact that if 66 votes were cast for every 100 *men* qualified to register in the suffrage States, as was done as a country-wide average, then less than 2,000,000 votes remain to have been cast by women.

Therefore, it is a mathematically demonstrated fact that less than 47 per cent. of the women qualified to register in 1916 actually went to the polls.

And this was at a national election in which women were alleged to be especially interested; a national election in which we would expect the maximum number of women to vote, even though at heart opposed to woman suffrage. It was an election at which the *men* of the suffrage States must have tried hard to get out the vote of the women of their families. Moreover, we had the Woman's Party, the Congressional Union, the Council of Woman Voters and the celebrated Hughes special all trying to get out the women's vote—yet a majority of them stayed at home at the same election where 66 men out of every 100 went to the polls, as an average for the United States! This notwithstanding educational qualifications in several States, and the virtual disfranchisement of several hundred thousand males in the South.

Could there be any more striking proof of the anti-suffrage statement that the majority of women do not desire the vote than the fact that the majority of women *could not be persuaded to exercise the elective franchise* at the most hotly contested Presidential election ever held in America?

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

THE general situation at the present time is:

Campaign States, 1917—Maine, New York, Ohio.

Campaign States, 1918—Arkansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma and Iowa.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE

Bills similar to the Illinois law, allowing women to vote for Presidential electors and municipal offices, etc., not named in the State Constitution, have been passed by the Legislatures of North Dakota, Ohio, Indiana, Arkansas, Michigan, Nebraska and Rhode Island.

Some of these bills are being referred to the people. Others *will be contested in the courts* as unconstitutional.

Practically every State Constitution is different in details, and the constitutionality of each bill must be determined by the Supreme Court of the State. Semi-suffrage is not by any means constitutional in Indiana because it has been so held in Illinois.

In Ohio, North Dakota and Arkansas the antis are working to get the bills defeated at the general election by referendum.

In the other States, the plan of campaign will be governed by local conditions. An examination of the Indiana Constitution, for instance, almost certainly indicates that the bill is not constitutional in that State, as it specifies that "in all other elections" not otherwise provided for in the Constitution, the voters shall be males, etc. North Dakota's law, also, is clearly unconstitutional, but will be referred to the people.

THE bill for a general suffrage referendum was defeated in the Illinois Legislature on April 10th, the President of the Illinois Woman Suffrage Association, Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, declaring that it was "an anti-suffrage measure" and that if a woman suffrage amendment were submitted to the people of Illinois, with a Constitutional convention proposition at the same time, "both would meet with defeat."—Springfield *Register,* April 11, 1917.

The fact that the suffragists frankly acknowledge their fear of defeat by popular vote in the State where at least 45 per cent. of *all American women who voted in* 1916 cast their ballots; and where the women's vote has been separately counted for three years, so that everybody could "see how it works," is more significant than all the wordy pleas made on platforms.

Instead of a blessing, Presidential suffrage may yet prove a fatal bomerang to woman suffrage.

The Presidential election is four years off—and by that time the suffragists will have a great many more anti-suffrage facts and figures to face than they have now. Every anti-suffrage debate has been won on *the record of results,* and with Russia and a few more States and territories giving women a chance to prove again that "Government Is a Man's Job," the ultimate outcome is obvious.

SUFFRAGE bills have recently been defeated in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania.

Connecticut has passed a resolution to submit the question to the people, after defeating all other suffrage propositions.

MAINE

THE Maine Association Opposed to Suffrage for Women looms large this season in the fight that is being waged against the proposed suffrage referendum, for when the question comes to the people of Maine, in September, the voters will be thoroughly informed—that is, the Maine anti-suffragists say that they will be. To this end, the Maine Association Opposed to Suffrage for Women, at its recent annual meeting, elected as the head of the organization Mrs. Harry Rust Virgin of Portland, a woman of rare tact and charm, who attracts by her personality as well as by her arguments.

At the headquarters, in the Press Building, Portland, women from all over Maine meet to discuss the situation and here, too, come great packages of mail, hundreds of telegrams and written arguments from men anxious to help in this effort to defeat the equal suffrage movement in September.

While the anti-suffragists in Maine have been very quiet about the work they have been doing, and while the greater number of the members of the Maine Association Opposed to Suffrage for Women dislike the publicity connected with the work they are doing, yet all realize that they have the game to play and must play with the same weapons used by the other side.

Meetings have been held in the Columbia Hotel parlors through the winter, as they have been for the past several seasons, but the real "anti" activities date from the moment that the members of the Maine organization began to realize that the question of suffrage was to be the center of a big fight and that work must be done and done quickly.

As soon as the decision was made to enter the campaign against the suffragists, the women connected with the organization opposed to suffrage found many men ready to stand back of them, and soon gifts of money began to be received by the workers, so that at the present time the anti-suffrage workers may be said to be "prepared" and their activities are numerous.

—Boston, Mass., *Post.*

MASSACHUSETTS

ON Friday, April 13th, the Executive Committee passed a resolution to offer the services of the Association to the Committee on Public Safety for active work. In accordance with this resolution, the president, Mrs. John Balch, sent the following letter to Mr. John D. Willard, Secretary of the Sub-Committee on Food Production and Conservation:

"The Executive Committee of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts desires to offer the facilities of its organization to the Committee on Food Production and Conservation.

"We have a membership throughout the State of more than forty thousand women of adult age, with 143 branches.

"We desire to serve your Committee in whatever way that Committee may think best. We can assure you that, should you find occasion to use our organization, our sole endeavor will be to serve the Commonwealth and no political propaganda will be tolerated for a moment.

"As early as January, 1916, the directors of our National Association passed the following resolution:

"'Be It Resolved, That women everywhere should strive to further the cause of Preparedness by the study of the sources and conservation of the food supply, by thrift and economy in household management and by training in the care for physical well-being of our people in times of peace as well as of National disaster.'"

"Your Committee will therefore recognize our earnest desire to help your special work.

"This is a time for coalition and co-operation and we will gladly work with any individuals or organizations seeking similar opportunities for service."

Nearly three hundred women were present at the New England Conference and Annual Meeting held in the Rose Room, Hotel Lenox, Boston, Thursday, April 26th.

Delegates were present from fifty-six Massachusetts towns.

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, president of the Connecticut Association; Mrs. A. T. Dudley, president of the New Hampshire Association, and Mrs. H. R. Virgin, president of the Maine Association, with delegates from their respective States, were guests of the Association.

Reports from the various Branches showed universal activity in all branches of patriotic and relief work, while the reports

of the Education and Organization, Membership, Branch Organization and Publicity Committees evidenced continued loyalty to and enthusiasm in our own work and proved that great progress had been made since the last annual meeting.

Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., who was the principal speaker at the conference, read a paper on Co-operation and Preparedness. Mrs. A. J. George was the speaker of the afternoon.

A resolution indorsing prohibition during the war for the conservation of grain, as well as for its moral effect, was unanimously passed.

Mrs. Stephen S. FitzGerald was elected President; Mrs. Thomas Allen and Mrs. B. A. Norton, Acting Vice-Chairmen; Mrs. A. H. Parker, Corresponding Secretary, and the old board was re-elected with the addition of Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins, Mrs. J. Bertram Williams and Miss M. Louise Brown.

NEW YORK STATE ACTIVITIES

THE State Council of the New York State Association met at Watertown on April 18th, at the Black River Valley Club.

Luncheon was served in the club ballroom at one o'clock, with 160 covers, after the singing of "America."

Mrs. E. B. Willard, toastmistress, introduced Mrs. F. M. Carpenter and Mrs. Harold Remington, of Watertown, who addressed the gathering.

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, State president, explained why the anti-suffragists cannot give up their work as long as the suffragists will not give up theirs.

"To give up our campaign at this time would be shirking a responsibility and an act of disloyalty to our State," she declared.

Delegates from Carthage, Oswego, Rochester, Brownville, Copenhagen, Malone, Deer River, Syracuse, Canton, Utica and New York city were present. The arrangements were in the hands of the Watertown Committee, of which Miss Betty Seiple is president.

The Union Glee and Musical Clubs, under the auspices of the Johnstown Auxiliary, gave a concert during April, of which a Gloversville paper said that if the number of those present was "any criterion of the popularity of the cause of the Antis, then their sisters on the other side of the fence ought to have many misgivings."

The program consisted of glee club, mandolin orchestra and ukelele club selections, followed by dancing and refreshments.

The affair was a financial success, and the committee made a donation of $50 to the Surgical Supply Committee of the Johnstown Chapter of the American Red Cross.

The committee consisted of Mrs. Frank L. Rogers, Mrs. Charles Gardner, Mrs. N. F. Wells, Miss Katheryn Cleary, Miss Irma Duesler, Mrs. T. Cuthell Calderwood, Mrs. J. F. Murray, Miss Anna Du Pree, Miss Margaret Hurley, Miss Marion Still, Miss Grace Mason, Miss Agnes Du Pree, Misses Alice and Louise Dechampalier, Mrs. A. D. Dennison, Mrs. George Porter, and Mrs. A. C. McIntyre.

Among other clubs and organizations before which our speakers have appeared during April, are: Riverside Republican Club, Federal Republican Club, Seventh Assembly District Republican Club, Thirteenth Assembly District Republican Club, Twenty-sixth Assembly District Republican Club, Educational Alliance, Cronomer (Newburgh) Grange, Southold Grange, Bullville Grange, Geneva Union Grange, Trumansburg Grange, Binghamton Rotary Club, Washington Heights Forum. The Brooklyn Auxiliary had ten meetings during April. At the monster patriotic meeting held by the Brooklyn Board of Trade in Prospect Hall, Miss Charlotte E. Rowe, of the New York State Association, was the first woman invited to speak.

The New York headquarters are turned over for every Monday afternoon to a Red Cross Auxiliary Committee, in charge of Mrs. Edward S. Kaufman and Miss Agnes Gould.

Mrs. Kaufman has been actively connected with a Red Cross station ever since the beginning of the war, and has a teacher's certificate. Miss Gould has taken the Red Cross course for surgical dressings. Mrs. H. V. Conrad will conduct the class in knitting for the Naval Comforts League.

The Rochester Committee Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been prominent in all war relief activities in Monroe County. Mrs. Edward Mulligan, chairman of the anti-suffrage executive board of Rochester, is an officer of the National League for Woman's Service, and many officers and members of the anti-suffrage association are represented in the Red Cross and other relief work.

NEW YORK STATE CAST 748,332 VOTES AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN 1915, DEFEATING IT BY 194,984. WHAT WILL YOU DO TO HELP INCREASE THE VOTE AND MAJORITY AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE NEXT NOVEMBER?

The largest surgical dressings activity in the county is under the direction of an anti-suffragist, and has been sending thousands of bandages to the New York Clearing House for shipment to France. These surgical dressings have been prepared so well that the Red Cross passes this anti-suffragist's work without examination in New York, and shipments are made directly through to Paris.

At a recent meeting held for the Relief of the Belgian Children in the Province of Hanault, $23,447 was raised by the Rochester Auxiliary, of which Mrs. George Carnahan is vice-president and Mrs. Gurney T. Curtis secretary.

During the first year of the war the Albany Auxiliary sent 13,799 articles to France through the War Relief Clearing House; the second year 14,811 articles were sent. This does not include large quantities of knitting yarn, comfort bags and condensed milk. Meetings have also been held to provide for the needs of the American army and navy. A meeting recently held at the home of Mrs. D. Cady Herrick voted to supply "B" troop, Tenth Battalion, and the men of the U. S. S. *New York* with periodicals and books.

Mrs. Nelson Henry, an ardent anti-suffragist, is head of one of the two divisions of the Canteen work of the National League for Woman's Service. A commandant heads each of the twenty units, with sixteen women in each unit. Miss Chittenden, and a number of other anti-suffragists, are serving as commandants. All the members have taken the necessary course in cooking, and are thoroughly organized, ready to supply coffee and sandwiches to the regiments passing through the city.

Headquarters for enrolling women who are volunteering to assist in taking the military census have been opened at the New York office, with Mrs. Arthur W. Francis chairman of the enrollment committee.

Mrs. Francis C. Landon and Mrs. Robert Olyphant, executive members, have presented the Association with a large American flag.

"LIKE A SUFFRAGE BANNER ON CONSTANT PARADE"

THERE is a disposition on the part of some suffragists to claim that Miss Jeannette Rankin, the first woman representative that the "cause" has placed in Congress, does not represent it.

The good that Miss Rankin does will be ascribed to woman suffrage by every form of publicity the suffragists can bring to bear. But whenever she casts an unpopular vote, or makes a bad decision, suffragists will say that she is only one woman, representing only Montana!

This excuse is pitifully inadequate. Without woman suffrage in Montana, Miss Rankin would not have gone to Congress.

A few days before she took her seat Miss Rankin declared: "A woman in Congress is just like a big suffrage banner on constant parade." (Address to Minnesota Senate, as reported by the Associated Press, March 29th.)

There is every evidence that Miss Rankin has sincerely tried to be a suffrage banner on constant parade, a true representative of her cause.

The day before she took her seat, the president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association and the head of the Congressional Union sat beside her at a meeting in her honor. Was it because she is a Republican? Was it because she comes from Missoula, Montana? It was *not*.

It was because she is a woman and a *suffragist!*

They cannot desert her now. Public opinion will not allow it. Miss Rankin represents the suffrage movement in Congress as faithfully as Mr. Meyer London represents the socialist movement, however fickle some feminists may prove.

Moreover, Montana does not seem to believe that Miss Rankin represents the State as well as she does her "cause." This is strikingly shown in the following editorial from the Butte, Mont., *Miner*, April 27th:

Miss Rankin had not been in Congress a week before she made it very plain that she was totally unfit for the position to which she aspires to fill.

This is no reflection upon her as a woman, but she has made it quite evident to the world that the office of Congressman is not a proper job for one of her sex, and she should have convinced every one by this time of the truth of this assertion.

Yesterday she gave further evidence of her utter incompetency in a reply sent to a request of the Butte Rotary and Pan-Hellenic clubs that she support the selective conscription measure, by sending the following telegram:

"I have heard of no one in the House who is supporting the President's conscription bill. Do you wish me to stand alone for this?"

Even as far away from Washington as the people of Montana are, they have the Associated Press' word for it that the friends of this measure announce they have a clear majority in the House for the bill.

Evidently Miss Rankin does not associate with her colleagues, or if she does they do not see fit to take her into their confidence concerning their position on great public issues.

In other words, she does not know as much of what is going on in the House as the average newspaper reader in Montana does, and this is certainly most unfortunate for this commonwealth.

Her election has virtually left this State with only one representative in Congress, when Montana actually has enough work for half a dozen or more Congressmen.

The lady's telegram to the Rotary Club is a pitiful confession of weakness and utter incompetency, and what is still more unfortunate for the State, it suggests that she has not yet reached a realization of her responsibilities in the position, and her complete inability to meet them.

Montana has rendered the nation a service in electing Miss Rankin to Congress, for her course appears to make it certain that the voters of other commonwealths who watch her career in Washington will not be foolish enough to send a woman to the House to represent them in the near future.

"MISS REPRESENTATIVE"

AT the Patriotic Anti-Suffrage Meeting at Cooper Union recently, several speakers mentioned Miss Jeanette Rankin, of Montana. When questions were in order, a man with a puzzled expression on his face arose and asked:

"What is the proper title for the lady congressman? Or is it congresswoman?

Miss Marjorie Dorman, one of the anti-suffrage speakers, replied:

"The lady should be called Miss Representative."

NOTES AND COMMENT

THE I. W. W. murder trial in Seattle began with six women and six men in the jury box. The trial is likely to last two months, the judge says. One old woman of seventy-five was excused from jury duty, because she thought the walk three times a day to the Young Women's Christian Association, where the women jurors are to be fed, the climbing of the court house steps, the long strain would be too much for her; another woman was put in her place.

Mrs. Sarah J. Timmer is juror No. 11. She had received word before she entered the box that "her children had contracted the measles."

Calling the jury in, Judge Ronald said to Mrs. Timmer:

"Mrs. Timmer, I have been informed that you are worried about your children. I'm powerless to let you go home, but both sides agreed that I may communicate to you any word your family physician desires to convey.

"Don't let your attention be attracted by anything but the trial. We'll keep you advised and you will have no cause to worry. Remember, no news is good news."

—Seattle *Post-Intelligencer*, March 8, 1917.

It must be a grand and glorious feeling for a woman to be drawn as juror on a murder case, likely to last two months, when she is just recovering from pneumonia, and the children of her family have just come down with the measles!—M. C. R.

DEBATERS, ATTENTION!

AN absolutely new question has been opened for debate, the like of which has never been argued before!

The question might be worded thus:

"*Resolved*, That a pacifist administration of the universe under Miss Jane Addams at Athens would have more effect on [here insert anything desired] than an American administration of the United States under President Wilson at Washington."

As the question is raised by Miss Addams, there may be facilities at Hull House, Chicago, for supplying material for debate, but a general idea of the stateswoman's-like (?) plan may be gained from the following:

"A central distribution system for the world, administered by a commission located in Athens, was advocated yesterday by Jane Addams in an address at Mandel Hall, University of Chicago, under the auspices of the women's administrative council. The title of the lecture was 'Pacificism and Patriotism.'

"'We should have a central distribution system for the world, administered by a commission located in Athens, Greece,' said Miss Addams. 'This commission should have charge of the food of the world and should prescribe the treatment of the people of the world.'"—Chicago *Herald*, May 8, 1917.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment — *Stephen H. Olin*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against the Federal Amendment — *Judge Oscar Leser*
A Destruction of the Right of Self-Government — *Hon. Elihu Root*
A Message from His Eminence, James, Cardinal Gibbons
Woman Suffrage and Prohibition — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. — *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound — *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman — *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot — *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida M. Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) — *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST
.....1917

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years' subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City.....State .....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....